

**REMARKS**

Claim 20 has been rewritten and amended as claim 45. Claims 30, 36, and 42 have also been amended. Support for these amendments can be found at least in paragraphs [0052], [0055], [0060] – [0061], and [0084] of the published subject application.

The claims as amended are allowable because the cited references, alone or in combination, do not disclose the claimed invention. As amended the claims clarify that (1) objects must be paired AND store the same common key for a first object to accept a command from a second object, and (2) when the first object receives a command from a second object, the first object verifies if the second object is paired with the first object AND if the second object stores the appropriate common key.

Because none of the cited references teach these claim requirements, the claims, as amended, are not obvious, and should be allowed. Applicant solicits a Notice of Allowance.

**I. Claims 21-24, 26-27, 30-34, 36-40, 42, and 44-45**

Applicant submits that none of Liotine, Heitschel, and Marino teach (1) objects storing both pairing information and a common key, and (2) when a first object receives a command from another object, that the first object both verifies that the two objects are paired and that the other object stores the appropriate common key.

**A. Objects in the claimed invention store two pieces of information.**

None of Liotine, Heitschel, and Marino discloses a bidirectional object storing two different pieces of information as required by the claimed invention. Instead, in Liotine, the only information shared and stored by the transmitter 9 and the receiver 30 is the code stored on the non-volatile memory 34 and 13. See Liotine, col. 4, ln. 40 – col. 5, ln. 40. The pending Office Action implicitly acknowledges this deficiency of Liotine by recognizing that the devices in Liotine do not store the pairing information of objects with which they are paired.

Similarly, in Heitschel, the only information shared and stored by the transmitter 24 and the control unit 38 is a signal of code words. See Heitschel, col. 3, ll. 43-56. The Office Action implicitly acknowledges this deficiency of Heitschel by recognizing that the devices in Heitschel do not store the pairing information of objects with which they are paired.

In Marino, the only information shared and stored by the transmitter and receiver is the device identification code of the transmitter. Thus, Marino does not teach an object storing two different pieces of information as required by the claimed invention.

The Office Action seems to assert that it would be obvious to combine the teachings of Liotine and Heitschel with the teachings of Marino to teach the claimed invention. However, even combining these references still would not teach the claimed invention.

In Marino, only the receiver stores the identification code of the transmitter. But, the transmitter does not store the identification code of the receiver. Thus, Marino does not teach “storing in the memory of the objects to be paired information on the identifier of the other object.” In Marino, only one object (the receiver) stores information on the identifier of the other object (the transmitter). This is unlike the claimed invention.

- B. When one object in the claimed invention receives a command from another object, the one object verifies that the two objects are paired and that the other object stores an appropriate common key.

In addition to the above and as discussed in an Examiner Interview on March 23, 2010, none of Liotine, Heitschel, or Marino teaches a first object receiving a command from a third object, the first object verifying that the two objects are paired, and the first object verifying that the new common key is stored in the memory of the third object as required by the claimed invention. Applicant has amended the pending claims to include these limitations pursuant to Office’s suggestion in the Examiner Interview and pursuant to an Interview Summary mailed by the Office on March 25, 2010.

C. The claimed invention is not obvious.

For at least the reasons as explained above, applicant submits that claims 21-24, 26-27, 30-34, 36-40, 42, and 44-45 are not obvious over any combination of Liotine, Heitschel, and Marino. Therefore, applicant requests allowance of these claims.

**II. Claims 25, 28, 35, 41, and 43**

As explained above, claims 30, 36, 42, and 45 from which claims 25, 28, 35, 41, and 43 depend are not obvious over any combination of Liotine, Heitschel, and Marino. Furthermore, Clark does not make up for the deficiencies of these references discussed above.

For at least these reasons, applicant submits that claims 25, 28, 35, 41, and 43 are not obvious over any combination of Liotine, Heitschel, Marino, and Clark. Therefore, applicant requests allowance of these claims.

**III. Claim 29**

As explained above, claim 45, from which claim 29 depends, is not obvious over any combination of Liotine, Heitschel, and Marino. Furthermore, Little does not make up for the deficiencies of these references discussed above.

For at least these reasons, applicant submits that claim 29 is not obvious over any combination of Liotine, Heitschel, Marino, and Little. Therefore, applicant requests allowance of this claim.


**IV. Closing Remarks**

For the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that the subject application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests allowance of the application. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution hereof, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the below-listed number.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee which may be required for this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.18, including but not limited to the issue fee, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-0920. Should no proper amount be enclosed herewith, such as a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 23-0920.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 26, 2010

By   
Erik B. Flom, Reg. No. 41,021  
Amy L. Hammer; Reg. No. 61,048  
HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS  
WELSH & KATZ  
120 South Riverside Plaza, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Phone: (312) 655-1500  
Fax: (312) 655-1501